REMARKS

Claims 1 through 17 are pending in the application.

The specification is objected to because of a spelling error. The specification is amended to obviate the objection.

Claims 3 and 8 are objected to for containing spelling and grammatical errors. Claims 3 and 8 are amended to obviate the objection.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner contends that subject matter contained in claim 16 is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention, as it is unclear how the magnetic force of the magnets is adjustable. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Section 2164.01 of the MPEP describes the standard for an enablement analysis, specifically that the claimed invention must be enabled so that any person skilled in the art can make and use the invention without undue experimentation. Furthermore, a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art. Applicant submits that methods of adjusting a magnetic field, such as replacing the magnets with magnets of differing strength, as suggested by the Examiner, as known methods of changing a magnetic field. Additional known methods for changing the magnetic force of a magnet on an object include changing the position of the magnet, for example. Therefore, because methods of adjusting the magnetic power exerted by a magnet are well known, using the invention as provided in claim 16 would not require undue experimentation. Thus, the invention as recited in claim 16 is enabled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 112 rejection of claim 16.

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,250,931 to Mendelson, hereinafter "Mendelson". Claims 1 and 17 are independent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 provides a breakaway power supply device operatively connectable to an appliance. The device includes a controller for sensing and/or controlling the temperature of said appliance, and a power cord with a first connector for connecting the power cord to the controller and a second connector for connecting the power cord to a power source. The first connector has at least two conductive connector outputs, and each of the two conductive outputs has a magnet therein.

Mendelson discloses a detachable power supply apparatus including a mounting panel for attachment to, for example, an appliance (col. 1, lines 57-60). A ferrous contact plate is attached to an outer surface of the mounting panel 24 (col. 1, 61-63). A pair of conductive pins or prongs extend through a central wall of the mounting panel (col. 4, lines 14-16). A power supply device includes a socket plug with a magnet subassembly attached at or near an outer surface thereof (col. 1, lines 63-65). The power supply device includes a female receptacle 46 having a central chamber 60 and a pair of side channels 62 (col. 4, lines 26-33). Conductive contact springs 65, each having a conductive contact 66, are secured within side channels 62 (col. 4, lines 34-37). A block-type magnet 74 is mounted within central chamber 60 (col. 4, lines 42-45).

Mendelson discloses a detachable power supply apparatus having a single magnet located between two conductive contacts. However, Mendelson does not disclose **two conductive contacts, each having a magnet** disposed therein. Therefore, Mendelson does not disclose or suggest a power supply device "wherein said first connector has at least two conductive connector outputs, and wherein each of said two conductive outputs has a magnet therein," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Mendelson fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Mendelson.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 4 and 6 are also patentable over Mendelson.

Independent claim 17 provides a power supply cord including a first connector for connecting to a power source, and a second connector, having a first plurality of conductive contacts, for connecting to a controller. The controller has a second plurality of conductive contacts and is operatively connectable to an electrical appliance. The second connector and the controller electrically and magnetically interact via an electrical and mechanical interaction between the first plurality of conductive contacts and the second plurality of conductive contacts.

Mendelson, as discussed above, discloses a detachable power supply apparatus having a mounting panel that includes two conductive pins providing an electrical contact with a female receptacle via two conductive contacts. Although Mendelson discloses electrical interaction between a plurality of contacts, Mendelson does not disclose any contacts that exhibit **both an electrical and magnetic interaction**. Therefore, Mendelson does not disclose or suggest a power supply device "wherein said second connector and said controller electrically and magnetically interact via an electrical and mechanical interaction between said first plurality of conductive contacts and said second plurality of conductive contacts," as recited in claim 17.

Thus, Mendelson fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over Mendelson.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Mendelson is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6 and 17 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 7 through 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendelson in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,211,456 to Sears, hereinafter "Sears". Claim 7 is independent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In addition to the features disclosed above, Mendelson also discloses that when receptacle 46 is coupled to mounting panel 24, pins 35 bias contacts 66 rearward (col. 5, lines 15-17). The diameter of holes 52 in the face of receptacle 46 are considerably larger than the diameter of the conductive pins 35, and the pins 35 are not frictionally engaged within the holes 52 as with conventional plugs (col. 5, lines 17-20). Instead, the magnetic coupling described above secures the receptacle 46 to the plug connection or mounting panel 24 with the desired release characteristics (col. 5, lines 20-22). Holes 52 are sized to allow the receptacle 46 to pivot or rock from side to side about the pins 35 in response to a shearing or lateral force to permit uncoupling of the receptacle 46 without additional frictional resistance or damage to the pins 35 (col. 5, lines 23-27).

Sears discloses the use of a permanent magnet within a female connector element that supplies a connective force between the female and male electrical connector elements (col. 1, lines 46-50).

There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the disclosures of Mendelson and Sears. Mendelson discloses a connection scheme that utilizes a block-type magnet 74 that is separate from the electrical contacts. Mendelson specifically teaches that magnet 74 secures receptacle 46 with desired release characteristics. Mendelson discloses that that receptacle 46 should be able to freely rock and pivot about pins 35 to permit uncoupling without additional frictional resistance or damage to pins 35. Thus, Mendelson teaches that only the central block magnet 74 should control release characteristics, and that there should be no additional forces acting on pins 35 or contacts 66 that would interfere with the ability of receptacle 46 to freely rock and pivot in responses to shear or lateral forces. Therefore, Mendelson teaches away from the use of magnetic materials as electrical contacts, which would introduce additional forces that would interfere with the ability of receptacle 46 to pivot and rock about pins 35.

Furthermore, the use of magnetic electrical contacts, as disclosed in Sears, in conjunction with the connection system of Mendelson would render the connection system of Mendelson unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Mendelson specifically discloses that receptacle 46 must be able to pivot or rock from side to side about pins 35. This feature of Mendelson requires that pins 35 must necessarily be able to freely separate from one or more of contacts 66 to allow for such a rocking motion. Utilizing magnetic electrical contacts would prevent pins 35 from being able to freely separate from contacts 66 so that receptacle 46 can freely rock or separate based on the release characteristics of the block magnet. Therefore, the inclusion of magnetic electrical contacts in Mendelson would render Mendelson unsatisfactory for it intended purpose.

Because Mendelson teaches away from the cited combination of Mendelson and Sears, and because the cited combination of Mendelson and Sears would render Mendelson unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the disclosures of Mendelson and Corona. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5 and 7 through 16 are patentable over the cited combination of Mendelson and Sears.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5 and 7 through 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Mendelson in view of Sears is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5 and 7 through 16 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

An indication of the allowability of all pending claims by issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 6, 2005

Charles N.J. Ruggiero
Reg. No. 28,468
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401